

AMENDMENTS TO THE DRAWINGS

The attached "Replacement Sheets" of drawings include changes to Figures 1 - 4 and 11. The attached "Replacement Sheets," which include Figures 1-14, replace the original sheets.

Attachment: Replacement Sheets

REMARKS

Claims 23-56 are now pending in the application. By this paper, the specification and drawings have been amended, Claims 1-22 have been canceled and Claims 23-56 are newly presented. Bases for the amendments and support for the new claims can be found throughout the written description, drawings, and claims as originally filed and as such, no new matter has been presented. The Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the rejections in view of the amendments and remarks contained herein.

CHANGE IN REPRESENTATION

The undersigned attorney notes that a Statement Under 37 CFR 3.73(b) and power of attorney were filed on January 9, 2009.

ELECTION & TELEPHONIC INTERVIEW

The undersigned attorney notes that the election filed September 11, 2008 elected the decoupler assembly of Figures 2-10 (Species I) and indicated that Claims 12-22 read on the elected species. However, Claims 1-11 read on elected Species I and Claims 12-22 read on unelected Species II, however.

The undersigned attorney conducted a telephonic interview with the Examiner to discuss resolution of above situation. The undersigned attorney and the Examiner were the sole participants in this interview and agreed that Claims 1-22 would be canceled and new claims would be presented (including original Claims 1-12 renumbered as

appropriate). The interview did not touch upon the merits of the rejections or the art cited by the Office.

PRIORITY

The Examiner has noted that while the Office has recognized a claim of priority under 35 U.S.C. §119(e), Applicant had not fully complied with the requirements under 37 CFR 1.78(a). By this paper Applicant has amended the specification to comply with 37 CFR 1.78(a).

AMENDMENTS TO THE SPECIFICATION

The Examiner noted in an objection to the drawings (discussed in more detail below) that Figure 9 failed to show an anti-ramp up boss 77 engaging the second side 47 and that Figure 10 failed to show the anti-ramp up boss 77 engaging the first side 45 as described in the specification. Applicant has amended the specification to refer to Figure 9 as showing the anti-ramp up boss 77 engaging the first side 45 and to refer to Figure 10 as showing the anti-ramp up boss 77 engaging the second side 47. Basis for the amendment can be found in the originally filed application and as such, Applicant submits that no new matter has been entered.

DRAWINGS

The drawings stand objected to for certain informalities. Applicant has attached revised drawings for the Examiner's approval. The following changes have been made in the "Replacement Sheets":

Figure 1 has been amended to include a leader line with reference character 15;

Figure 2 has been amended to show the carrier (75) in a manner that is consistent with what is described in the specification and illustrated in Figures 6 and 8;

Figure 3 has been amended to move reference numeral 34, add reference numeral 39, move the leader for reference numeral 48, and revise the area where the carrier (75) and the thrust plate (39) abut one another so that it is consistent with what is described in the specification and shown in Figures 6-10;

Figure 4 has been amended to show reference numeral 34 in a manner that is consistent with Figure 3, add reference numeral 39, and revise the area where the carrier (75) and the thrust plate (39) abut one another so that it is consistent with what is described in the specification and shown in Figures 6-10; and

Figure 11 has been amended to show the carrier (175) in a manner that is consistent with what is described in the specification and shown in Figures 6 and 12.

Concerning the objections noted in paragraph 5(d) & (e) on page 4 of the above-referenced Office Action, Applicant directs the Examiner to the above section entitled "Amendments to the Specification".

Concerning the objection noted in paragraph 5(f) on page 4 of the above-referenced Office Action, Applicant directs the Examiner to the above section entitled "Election & Telephonic Interview."

In view of the attached Replacement Sheets and above remarks, Applicant respectfully requests that the objection to the drawings be withdrawn.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 112

Claims 12-22 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. Applicant notes that Claims 12-22 have been canceled.

NEW CLAIMS

Claims 23-56 are newly presented by this paper. Claims 23-32, 38-45 and 51 are generic (i.e., they read on both elected Species I and non-elected Species II), Claims 33, 34, 46, 47, 52 and 53 read on elected Species I and Claims 35-37, 48-50 and 54-56 read on non-elected Species II.

Applicant notes that newly presented independent Claims 23 and 51 are directed to a decoupler assembly and includes a hub, a carrier, which is rotatably mounted on the hub, a thrust plate and a torsion spring that extends axially between the hub and the carrier. The torsion spring has opposite ends that are engaged to the carrier and coupled to the hub to transfer torque from the hub to the carrier. Applicant further notes that Claims 23 and 51 include an anti-ramp up feature, which is coupled to one of the carrier and the thrust plate, and a circumferentially extending slot that is associated with the other one of the carrier and the thrust plate.

In contrast, Lowery (U.S. Pat. No. 3,844,390) is directed to a shaft clutch that employs a wrap spring that is employed to selectively transmit torque between an input drum (12) and an output drum (14). Applicant submits that Lowery lacks structure onto which Claim 23 can be fairly read. For example, if the output drum (14), the control collar (18) and the helical spring (16) of Lowery constitute a "hub", a "carrier" and a

"torsion spring", respectively, as stated by the Office in their evaluation of Claim 12 (which was canceled by this paper), Applicant notes that the helical spring (16) does not extend axially between the output drum (14) and the control collar (18) and that during operation of the device of Lowery, torque is not transmitted from the control collar (18) to the output drum (14). Regarding the latter point, see the discussion in Lowery at column 3, line 64-column 4, line 7.

Similarly, Applicant submits that Malion et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 3,837,450) lacks structure onto which Claims 23 and 51 can be fairly read. For example, if the output member (12), the sleeve (14) and the helical coil spring (13) of Malion et al. constitute a "hub", a "carrier" and a "torsion spring", respectively, as stated by the Office in their evaluation of Claim 12 (which was canceled by this paper), Applicant notes that during operation of the device of Malion et al., torque is not transmitted from the sleeve (14) to the output member (12).

Accordingly, Applicant submits that independent Claims 23 and 51 are allowable over the art of record and that Claims 24 through 50 and 52 through 56, which are dependent from Claims 23 and 51, respectively, are also allowable over the art of record.


CONCLUSION

It is believed that all of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw all presently outstanding rejections. It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office

Action and the present application is in condition for allowance. Thus, prompt and favorable consideration of this amendment is respectfully requested. If the Examiner believes that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at (248) 641-1600.

Respectfully submitted,

By:


Michael D. Zalobsky
Reg. No. 45,512

Dated: January 23, 2009

HARNESS, DICKEY & PIERCE, P.L.C.
P.O. Box 828
Bloomfield Hills, Michigan 48303
(248) 641-1600

MDZ/cr